

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Claim 5 was objected to because of informalities. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dinger, U.S. Patent No. 4,084,876. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinger in view of Yamagiwa, JP 54-53283. Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinger in view of Getselis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,039,597. Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 5 has been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled. New claims 13 and 14 have been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Objection to claim 5

Claim 5 was objected to due to informalities. Claim 5 has now been amended to recite the word “the” prior to “support”. Applicant thanks the Examiner for pointing out this error.

Withdrawal of the objection to claim 5 is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 has now been canceled.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dinger, U.S. Patent No. 4,084,876.

Dinger describes an electrical connector having a finger 236 with free end 242 and a

stub tine 306 with a free end 324 for trapping a wire 64 between the respective free ends. See col. 4, lines 25-33, and Fig. 8.

Independent claim 1 recites “when clamped, the at least one electrical conductor is bent around the freestanding edge so as to provide an interlocking effect”. It is respectfully submitted that Dinger does not teach or suggest an electrical conductor bent around the freestanding edge so as to provide an interlocking effect, as recited. In contrast, in Dinger the wire 24 is merely “trapped” by the free ends 242 and 324. Indeed, Fig. 8 of Dinger shows straight wires 64 and 66; the wires are not “bent around” free end 234 (or 324) so as to provide an interlocking effect, as recited in claim 1. See Dinger, col. 4, lines 31-33, and Fig. 8. Because Dinger is missing at least the above-recited features of claim 1, it cannot anticipate this claim or its dependent claims.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 3-5 and 7-11, under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Dinger is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to claim 2

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinger in view of Yamagiwa, JP 54-53283. Claim 2 has now been canceled.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Dinger in view of Yamagiwa is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to claim 12

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dinger in view of Getselis et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,039,597.

Dependent claim 12 properly depends from and therefore includes all the limitations of independent claim 1. Getselis et al. does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1 missing from Dinger. Therefore, a combination of Dinger and Getselis et al. could not teach or suggest all the features recited in dependent claim 12.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Dinger in view of Getselis et al. is respectfully requested.

Allowable subject matter

Claim 6 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. New independent claim 13 has accordingly now been added incorporating all of the limitations of claim 6 and its base claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 13 is therefore allowable.

New claim 14

New claim 14 has been added depending from claim 12. New claim 14 recites “the freestanding edge projects toward the clamping leg” and “the clamping leg is offset behind the freestanding edge in the conductor insertion direction so that the freestanding edge projects toward the clamping leg ahead of the clamping leg in the conductor insertion direction.” Support for new claim 14 may be found, for example, at paragraph [0017] of the specification and Fig. 1. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that new claim 14 is patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 

William C. Gehris, Reg. No. 38,156
(signing for Erik R. Swanson, Reg. No. 40,833)

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue, 14th Floor
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940